Quantum resource studied from the perspective of quantum state superposition

Chengjun Wu,[1] Junhui Li,[1] Bin Luo,[2] and Hong Guo[1,*]
[1] *State Key Laboratory of Advanced Optical Communication, Systems and Networks, School of Electronics Engineering and Computer Science, and Center for Quantum Information Technology, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China and*
[2] *State Key Laboratory of Information Photonics and Optical Communications, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Beijing 100876, China*
(Dated: April 2, 2015)

Quantum resources,such as discord and entanglement, are crucial in quantum information processing. In this paper, quantum resources are studied from the aspect of quantum state superposition. We define the local superposition (LS) as the superposition between basis of single part, and nonlocal superposition (NLS) as the superposition between product basis of multiple parts. For quantum resource with nonzero LS, quantum operation must be introduced to prepare it, and for quantum resource with nonzero NLS, nonlocal quantum operation must be introduced to prepare it. We prove that LS vanishes if and only if the state is classical and NLS vanishes if and only if the state is separable. From this superposition aspect, quantum resources are categorized as superpositions existing in different parts. These results are helpful to study quantum resources from a unified frame.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Mn,03.65.Ta

arXiv:1405.1109v2 [quant-ph] 1 Apr 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum resources are crucial in quantum information processing [1–4]. Quantum entanglement, the first proposed quantum resource, has shown to be important in quantum computation [1–3], quantum teleportation [5, 6], superdense coding [7], quantum cryptography [8, 9], Bell test [10, 11], etc. However, states without quantum entanglement but with nonzero quantum discord [12] are also useful in some quantum information process, e.g., deterministic quantum computation with one qubit [13, 14], remote quantum state preparation [15, 16], thus also being considered as quantum resource. These resources have been studied from several perspectives, such as Von Neumann entropy[12, 17, 18], distance[19–22], and so on[23–26]. Since all entangled states have nonzero discord, entangled states are considered as a subset of quantum discordant states[12], but whether entanglement and discord are different resources is still an open question.

In this paper, we study the quantum resources from the aspect of quantum state superposition. For a state in composite system, we define the local superposition (LS) as the superposition between basis of single part, and nonlocal superposition (NLS) as the superposition between product basis of multiple parts. In this state superposition framework, quantum resources can be categorized by the superposition between different kinds of basis including different parts. We show that a state is classical when and only when it has zero local superposition and a state is separable when and only when it has zero nonlocal superposition. As for the relation of state superposition to the previously proposed quantum entanglement and quantum discord, quantum entanglement can be considered as the quantification of nonlocal superposition but excluding the local superposition, while quantum discord includes the local superposition. However, whether quantum discord also includes nonlocal superposition is not determined in this paper.

Moreover, the LS and NLS introduced hereinafter is generalized to multidimensional and multipartite systems. For multipartite states, we find that for pure states with Schmidt decomposition, NLS equals LS, while for pure states without Schmidt decomposition, NLS and LS might be different. This state superposition perspective might be useful in studying the multipartite entanglement. For multipartite systems, we show explicitly the different kinds of state superpositions existing in different single part of the system, some composite parts, or all parts of the system. These plural superpositions, thus plural resources, provide us with many ways to explore the quantum feature of quantum systems.

This paper is organized as follows. In part II, we first introduce the local superposition in two state bipartite system and then generalize it to multidimensional bipartite system. In part III, nonlocal superposition for two partite system is introduced. In part IV, LS and NLS are defined and analyzed for multipartite system. In the V part, several discussions are given. In part VI, main conclusions are presented. In the appendix, some proofs of the statements in the paper are provided.

II. LOCAL SUPERPOSITION IN BIPARTITE SYSTEM

When considering a quantum state with superposition in the $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ basis, $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, the coherence of the state can be defined as $C(\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}) = 2|\alpha||\beta| =$

*Correspondence author: hongguo@pku.edu.cn

$2(P(|0\rangle)P(|1\rangle))^{1/2}$, where $|\alpha|^2 = P(|0\rangle) = \langle\psi \mid 0\rangle\langle 0 \mid \psi\rangle$, $|\beta|^2 = P(|1\rangle) = \langle\psi \mid 1\rangle\langle 1 \mid \psi\rangle$, and $P(|0\rangle)$ and $P(|1\rangle)$ are the probability for state $|\psi\rangle$ in state $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. Zero coherence indicates that there is no state superposition, and thus this state has no superposition between basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. On the contrary, if the coherence gets the maximum value 1, there is perfect state superposition between basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. There are other cases between these two extreme ones. Therefore, it is reasonable to define the amount of superposition of $|\psi\rangle$ between basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ as

$$S(|\psi\rangle, \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}) = 2(P(|0\rangle)P(|1\rangle))^{1/2}. \quad (1)$$

Eq. (1) indicates that when $S(|\psi\rangle, \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}) \neq 0$, there must be state superposition between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. Note that the value in Eq. (1) is dependent on the basis chosen, that is the amount of superposition defined above is basis specific.

Consider a system A in a composite system AB, for example, a singlet state, $|\psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$, no matter which basis for system A is used, it is hard to say that A is in a state superposition of that basis. Actually, in this case, it is impossible to assign a state description of system A. However, for this state, when the basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ is chosen, system A will behave exactly as if it is in state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$, assuming that there is no operation on B. (Note that, this assumption is true, since if there is some operation on B, then this composite system should be described by a different state.) Thus, from this point, we generalize the state superposition in system A and define the amount of superposition of this state in system A in the same way as Eq. (1). Generally, for a two qubits pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$, we define the amount of superposition of A in the $\{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}$ basis (through this paper, when basis is mentioned, it refers to orthonormal basis) as

$$S_A(|\psi\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}) = 2\big(P(|\varphi\rangle_A)P(|\varphi^\perp\rangle_A)\big)^{1/2}, \quad (2)$$

where $P(|\varphi\rangle_A) = \mathrm{Tr}_B[{}_A\langle\varphi \mid \psi\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi \mid \varphi\rangle_A]$, which is the probability for system A in state $|\varphi\rangle_A$. More generally, for a specific decomposition of mixed state $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$ ($\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi_i|$), we define the amount of superposition of A in $\{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}$ basis as

$$\sum_i p_i S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}).$$

The above superposition is introduced by the basis of part A, and we define this as the local superposition with respect to part A.

Definition: The measure of LS of ρ_{AB} for part A is defined as

$$LS_A(\rho) = \min \sum_i p_i S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}), \quad (3)$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$ and all basis $\{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}$.

Note that the LS defined in Eq. (3) is basis independent. From the perspective of preparation, we have the choice to choose different basis. For $LS_A = 0$, there exists a certain decomposition and basis that no superposition presents, and thus part A can be prepared via classical operation (we use classical operation to mean the operation that no quantum superposition is introduced and use quantum operation to mean the other). For $LS_A \neq 0$, no matter which decomposition and basis are considered, there is superposition in part A, and thus part A can only be prepared via quantum operation. For example: for state $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle_A + |1\rangle_A)(|0\rangle_B + |1\rangle_B)$, the local superposition in the $\{|0\rangle_A, |1\rangle_A\}$ basis is nonzero and quantum operation is needed for the preparation when this basis is chosen, while the local superposition between basis $\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_A + |1\rangle_A), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_A - |1\rangle_A)\right\}$ is zero and classical operation is enough for the preparation when this basis is chosen. Thus, from the aspect of preparation, Eq. (3) shows the minimum amount of superposition produced in part A when preparing this state.

Theorem 1: For pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$, $LS_A = 0$ iff the state is a product state.

Proof. For general pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = a_{00}|00\rangle + a_{01}|01\rangle + a_{10}|10\rangle + a_{11}|11\rangle$, by Schmidt decomposition, it can be written as $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \alpha|0'0'\rangle + \beta|1'1'\rangle$, where α and β are the singular value of matrix A (with a_{ij} being its elements) and $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$. By setting basis $|\varphi\rangle_A = \sin(\theta/2)|0'\rangle + e^{i\phi}\cos(\theta/2)|1'\rangle$, $|\varphi^\perp\rangle_A = -e^{-i\phi}\cos(\theta/2)|0'\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|1'\rangle$ and considering Eq. (3), we can get $LS_A = 2|\alpha||\beta|$ (the detailed proof of this formula is given in appendix). If $LS_A = 0$ then $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 0$, in either case, $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ is a product state. If $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ is a product state, then $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 0$, thus $LS_A = 0$. Q.E.D.

Theorem 2: For state ρ_{AB}, the necessary and sufficient condition for $LS_A = 0$ is that ρ_{AB} can be written in the following form

$$\rho_{AB} = p_1|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi| \otimes \rho_B^1 + p_2|\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\langle\varphi^\perp| \otimes \rho_B^2. \quad (4)$$

Proof. For mixed state that can be written as the form $\rho_{AB} = p_1|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi| \otimes \rho_B^1 + p_2|\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\langle\varphi^\perp| \otimes \rho_B^2$, since basis $\{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}$ can be chosen, thus we have $LS_A = 0$.

For states with $LS_A = 0$, from the definition (see Eq. (3)), we know that there must exist a decomposition $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi_i|$ and a basis $\{|\psi\rangle_A, |\psi^\perp\rangle_A\}$ such that for each $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$, $S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\}) = 0$. From Eq. (2), $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$ must can be written as $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB} = |\psi_i\rangle_A \otimes |\psi_i\rangle_B$, and $|\psi_i\rangle_A$ is either $|\varphi\rangle_A$ or $|\varphi^\perp\rangle_A$. Summing the corresponding terms with $|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi|$ and $|\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\langle\varphi^\perp|$, respectively, we have $\rho_{AB} = p_1|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi| \otimes \rho_B^1 + p_2|\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\langle\varphi^\perp| \otimes \rho_B^2$. Q.E.D.

Note that Eq. (4) is also the necessary and sufficient condition for the original definition of quantum discord

(when measurement is done to part A) to be zero [12], and it is called a classical-quantum state [2].

For any state ρ_{AB}, the following inequality holds, $0 \leq LS_A(\rho_{AB}) \leq 1$. The proof is given in appendix.

In the same way, for part B,

$$LS_B(\rho_{AB}) = \min \sum_i p_i S_B(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_B, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_B\}),$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$ and all basis $\{|\varphi\rangle_B, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_B\}$. The necessary and sufficient condition for $LS_B = 0$ is that ρ_{AB} can be decomposed in the following form

$$\rho_{AB} = p_1 \rho_A^1 \otimes |\varphi\rangle_B \langle\varphi| + p_2 \rho_A^2 \otimes |\varphi^\perp\rangle_B \langle\varphi^\perp|,$$

which is called a quantum-classical state [2]. This is also the necessary and sufficient condition for the original definition of quantum discord (when measurement is done to part B) to be zero[12].

Note that LS_A and LS_B are neither symmetric. A symmetric one can be defined

$$LS = \min \sum_i p_i \frac{1}{2}[S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, |\varphi\rangle_A, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A) + S_B(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, |\varphi\rangle_B, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_B)], \quad (5)$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$ and all basis $\{|\psi\rangle_A, |\psi^\perp\rangle_A\}$, $\{|\varphi\rangle_B, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_B\}$.

Theorem 3: For any state ρ_{AB}, $LS = 0$ iff it can be written as

$$\rho_{AB} = p_1 |\varphi\rangle_A \langle\varphi| \otimes |\varphi\rangle_B \langle\varphi| + p_2 |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A \langle\varphi^\perp| \otimes |\varphi^\perp\rangle_B \langle\varphi^\perp|. \quad (6)$$

The proof is similar to theorem 2, and will be omitted. The state in the right side of Eq. (6) is a classical state [2]. This means that for $LS = 0$, the state can be prepared without quantum operation in either parts, while for $LS \neq 0$, quantum operation must be introduced to prepare this state. It is obvious that a state is quantum discordant when and only when it has local superposition. Note that, generally, $LS \geq (LS_A + LS_B)/2$ (the proof will be given in appendix). LS_A, LS_B, and LS range from 0 to 1.

This definition can be easily generalized to multidimensional case. Consider a two partite system with dimension d_A and d_B for each subsystem, for state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$, the amount of superposition between basis $\{|\varphi^j\rangle_A\}$ is defined as

$$S_A(|\psi\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi^j\rangle_A\}) = 2\left(\sum_{m<n} P(|\varphi^m\rangle) P(|\varphi^n\rangle)\right)^{1/2}, \quad (7)$$

where $P(|\varphi^m\rangle) = \mathrm{Tr}_B\left[{}_A\langle\varphi^m \mid \psi\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi \mid \varphi^m\rangle_A\right]$, $m = 1, \cdots, d_A$. Hence the amount of LS in part A for $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle_{AB} \langle\psi_i|$ is

$$LS_A = \min \sum_i p_i S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi^j\rangle_A\}), \quad (8)$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$ and all basis $\{|\varphi^j\rangle_A\}$. In the same way, LS_B for part B and LS for both parts can be defined analogous to previous bipartite two-state definitions. Correspondingly, $LS = 0$ holds iff $\rho_{AB} = \sum_{ij} p_{ij} |\varphi^i\rangle_A \langle\varphi^i| \otimes |\varphi^j\rangle_B \langle\varphi^j|$, where $\{|\varphi^i\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|\varphi^j\rangle_B\}$ are orthonormal basis for system A and B, respectively.

Example: For state in 3×3 system, $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i,j=1,2,3} a_{ij} |ij\rangle$, by using the parametrization of 3 dimensional unitary matrix [27] thus running over all the basis, the LS in side A or B can be numerically obtained. We compare the numerical results with $2(\lambda_1{}^2\lambda_2{}^2 + \lambda_1{}^2\lambda_3{}^2 + \lambda_2{}^2\lambda_3{}^2)^{1/2}$, where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ are the singular value (also called Schmidt coefficients) of matrix A (with a_{ij} being its elements). Specifically, for pure state

$$|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\lambda |00\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\lambda |11\rangle + \sqrt{1-\lambda^2} |22\rangle,$$

where $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$. the value expressed by singular value



FIG. 1: (color online) For pure state, $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \lambda\sqrt{2}/\sqrt{3}\,|00\rangle + \lambda 1/\sqrt{3}\,|11\rangle + \sqrt{1-\lambda^2}\,|22\rangle$, the LS (green star line) compared with $\sqrt{2}/3\lambda^2 + 2(\sqrt{2}+1)\lambda\sqrt{1-\lambda^2}/\sqrt{3}$(blue solid line)

is $\sqrt{2}/3\lambda^2 + 2(\sqrt{2}+1)\lambda\sqrt{1-\lambda^2}/\sqrt{3}$. As shown in Fig. **??** they are the same. For the fifth point in Fig. 2, $\lambda = 0.2$, $LS = 0.583986531642978$, and results by Schmidt coefficients equals 0.583986531642978. However, due to the complicate calculations, it is hard to strictly prove that $LS = 2(\lambda_1{}^2\lambda_2{}^2 + \lambda_1{}^2\lambda_3{}^2 + \lambda_2{}^2\lambda_3{}^2)^{1/2}$.

III. NONLOCAL SUPERPOSITION IN BIPARTITE SYSTEM

Consider, for pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = a_{00}|00\rangle + a_{01}|01\rangle + a_{10}|10\rangle + a_{11}|11\rangle$, the state superposition in the product basis, i.e., $|\varphi^{00}\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi\rangle_B$, $|\varphi^{10}\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi^{\perp}\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi\rangle_B$, $|\varphi^{01}\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi^{\perp}\rangle_B$, $|\varphi^{11}\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi^{\perp}\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi^{\perp}\rangle_B$. Since all parts of the system are included in the product basis, we define the state superposition between the product basis as nonlocal superposition. For state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$, the amount of nonlocal superposition in this set of basis is defined as

$$NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB}\}) = 2\left(\sum_{2m+n<2k+l} P(|\varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB}) P(|\varphi^{kl}\rangle_{AB})\right)^{1/2}, \quad (9)$$

where $P(|\varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB}) = {}_{AB}\langle\varphi^{mn} \mid \psi\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi \mid \varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB}$, $m,\ n = 0,\ 1$, and the sum is taken over all m, n, k, l satisfying $2m + n < 2k + l$.

Definition: The amount of NLS of state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ is defined as

$$NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = \min NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB}\}), \quad (10)$$

where the minimum is taken over all product basis $\{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB}\}$.

Theorem 4: For pure state, $NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = 0$ iff $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ is a product state.

Proof. For product state $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = |\psi\rangle_A \otimes |\psi\rangle_B$, product basis $\{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB}\}$, in which $|\varphi^{00}\rangle = |\psi\rangle_A \otimes |\psi\rangle_B$, can be chosen. Therefore, in this case, there is no state superposition between the chosen basis, and $NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = 0$. If $NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = 0$, from Eq. (10)and Eq. (**??**), there exists a product basis $\{|\varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB}\}$ that only one $P(|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB})$ is nonzero. Thus, we have $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi^{i}\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi^{j}\rangle_B$, which is a product state. Q.E.D.

For $NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) \neq 0$, no matter which set of product basis is chosen, there is state superposition between the basis.

For any pure state $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = a_{00}|00\rangle + a_{01}|01\rangle + a_{10}|10\rangle + a_{11}|11\rangle$, by Schmidt decomposition, it can be written as $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \alpha|0'0'\rangle + \beta|1'1'\rangle$, where α and β are the singular value of matrix A (with a_{ij} being its elements) and $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$. The numeric result of NLS of this pure state is compared with concurrence [18], which in this case is $2\alpha\beta$. As shown in Fig. 2, NLS and concurrence are the same. Since for any pure state, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\beta = \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}$ holds, the results in Fig. 2 has compared all the pure states. For the fifth point in Fig. 2, $\alpha = 4/19$, $NLS = 0.411616080243916$, and $Concurrence = 0.411616080243916$. However, due to the complicate calculations, it is hard to strictly prove that $NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = 2\alpha\beta$.

The concurrence, when used in the definition of entanglement of formation, is only a mathematical expression. From this state superposition perspective, concurrence can also be directly considered as the amount of nonlocal superposition existing in state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$.



FIG. 2: (color online) NLS (blue solid line) and Concurrence (asterisk marked) as the function of parameter α.

Definition: The amount of NLS for mixed state ρ_{AB} is defined as, according to convex roof theory [28],

$$NLS(\rho_{AB}) = \min \sum_i p_i NLS(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}), \quad (11)$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i,\ |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$.

Note that the minimum taken here is different from that in LS. In NLS, local quantum operation, which will not introduce any nonlocal superposition, should be allowed. By local unitary operation, any two different product basis can be changed to each other, e.g., for $\{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi^{i}\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi^{j}\rangle_B\}$ and $\left\{|\varphi'^{ij}\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi'^{i}\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi'^{j}\rangle_B\right\}$, by local unitary operation in part A, we can change $\{|\varphi^{i}\rangle_A\}$ to $\left\{|\varphi'^{i}\rangle_A\right\}$, and the same way for part B. Therefore, in NLS (Eq. (11)) for each $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$, unlike the minimum in the definition of LS (Eq. (3)) where the basis is the same for every $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$, different product basis should be allowed.

From the perspective of preparation, as showed above, by local quantum operation, we have the choice to choose product basis (without introducing any nonlocal superposition) for the preparation of each pure state ensemble $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$. Thus, Eq. (11) gives the minimum nonlocal superposition produced in the preparation. When $NLS(\rho_{AB}) = 0$, by choosing certain decomposition and basis, local quantum operation is enough to prepare the state, while when $NLS(\rho_{AB}) \neq 0$, no matter which decomposition and product basis are chosen, nonlocal quantum operation must be introduced.

Theorem 5: For any state ρ_{AB}, $NLS(\rho_{AB}) = 0$ iff ρ_{AB} is separable (ρ_{AB} can be written as $\rho_{AB} = \sum_k p_k \rho_A^k \otimes \rho_B^k$).

Proof. If $\rho_{AB} = \sum_k p_k \rho_A^k \otimes \rho_B^k$, each ρ_A^k and ρ_B^k can be decomposed again into pure state ensemble, $\rho_A^k = \sum_i p_{kA}^i |\varphi^{ki}\rangle_A \langle\varphi^{ki}|$, $\rho_B^k = \sum_i p_{kB}^i |\varphi^{ki}\rangle_B \langle\varphi^{ki}|$, where $\{|\varphi^{ki}\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|\varphi^{ki}\rangle_B\}$ are orthogonal basis for each system. Thus, ρ_{AB} can be decomposed as $\rho_{AB} = \sum_{k,i,j} p_k p_{kA}^i p_{kA}^i |\varphi^{ki}\rangle_A \langle\varphi^{ki}| \otimes |\varphi^{ki}\rangle_B \langle\varphi^{ki}|$. Under this decomposition, each pure state ensemble is a pure product state, which, according to theorem 4, has zero nonlocal superposition. Thus, if ρ_{AB} is separable, $NLS(\rho_{AB}) = 0$.

If $NLS(\rho_{AB}) = 0$, according to Eq. (11), there exists a certain decomposition $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$, that for each $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$, $NLS(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}) = 0$. According to theorem 4, each $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}$ is a product state, $|\psi_i\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi_i\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle_B$. Thus, ρ_{AB} can be written as $\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i |\varphi_i\rangle_A \langle\varphi_i| \otimes |\varphi_i\rangle_B \langle\varphi_i|$, which is a separable state. Q.E.D.

Theorem 5 directly indicates that a state is entangled when and only when it has nonlocal superposition. Thus, from this superposition perspective, entanglement can be considered as the nonlocal superposition existing in the system. Besides, as we numerically showed above, for pure state, concurrence and NLS are the same. According to the way concurrence calculated for mixed states in Ref. [18] , for any two qubits, NLS has the same value as concurrence.

This definition can be easily generalized to multidimensional states. Consider a bipartite system with dimension d_A and d_B for each subsystem, for state $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} \sum_{j=1}^{d_B} a_{ij} |i\rangle_A |j\rangle_B$, the amount of NLS between product basis $|\varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB} = |\varphi^m\rangle_A \otimes |\varphi^n\rangle_B$, where $m = 1, \cdots, d_A$, $n = 1, \cdots, d_B$ and $\{|\varphi^m\rangle_A\}$, $\{|\varphi^n\rangle_B\}$ are othonormal basis of system A and B, respectively, is defined as

$$NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB}\}) = 2\left(\sum_{md_B+n<kd_B+l} P(|\varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB}) P(|\varphi^{kl}\rangle_{AB})\right)^{1/2},$$

where $P(|\varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB}) = {}_{AB}\langle\varphi^{mn} \mid \psi\rangle_{AB} \langle\psi \mid \varphi^{mn}\rangle_{AB}$ and the summation is taken over all m, n, k, l satisfying $md_B + n < kd_B + l$. The amount of NLS of state $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$ is

$$NLS(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = \min NLS(\{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB}\}), \qquad (12)$$

where the minimum is taken over all product basis $\{|\varphi^{ij}\rangle_{AB}\}$. Using convex roof theory, NLS for mixed states can also be defined.

IV. LOCAL AND NONLOCAL SUPERPOSITION IN MULTIPARTITE SYSTEM

The definition of LS and NLS can be generalized to multipartite case. Assuming an n partite system with dimension d_m for the mth subsystem, for pure state

$$|\psi\rangle_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} = \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} a_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} |i\rangle_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes |i\rangle_n,$$

where $i_m = 1, \ldots, d_m$, the amount of LS for the mth part, when basis $\{|\varphi^{i_m}\rangle_m\}$ is chosen, reads

$$LS_m(|\psi\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}, \{|\varphi^{i_m}\rangle_m\}) = 2\left(\sum_{k_m<l_m} P(|\varphi^{k_m}\rangle_m) P(|\varphi^{l_m}\rangle_m)\right)^{1/2},$$

where $P(|\varphi^{k_m}\rangle_m) = \mathrm{Tr}_{1,\ldots,m-1,m+1,\ldots,n}[{}_m\langle\varphi^{k_m} \mid \psi\rangle_{1,\ldots,n} \langle\psi \mid \varphi^{k_m}\rangle_m]$. For a mixed state $\rho_{1,\ldots,n} = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle_{1,\ldots,n} \langle\psi_i|$, the amount of LS for the mth part is defined as

$$LS_m(\rho_{1,\ldots,n}) = \min \sum_i p_i LS_m(|\psi_i\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}, \{|\varphi^{i_m}\rangle_m\}), \qquad (13)$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}\}$ and all basis $\{|\psi^{j_m}\rangle_m\}$. The amount of LS including all parts is

$$LS = \min \sum_i p_i \frac{1}{n} \sum_m LS_m(|\psi_i\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}, \{|\varphi^{i_m}\rangle_m\}), \qquad (14)$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}\}$ and all basis $\{|\psi^{j_1}\rangle_1\}, \ldots, \{|\psi^{j_n}\rangle_n\}$. Eq. (14) indicates that $LS = 0$ iff $\rho_{1,\ldots,n}$ can be written as $\rho_{1,\ldots,n} = \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} p_{i_1,\ldots,i_n} |i_1\rangle\langle i_1| \otimes \cdots \otimes |i_n\rangle\langle i_n|$, where $\{|i_m\rangle\}$ is the orthonormal basis of part m.

For NLS, for pure state $|\psi\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}$, when choosing product basis $|\varphi^{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\rangle = |\varphi_1^{i_1}\rangle \otimes \ldots \otimes |\varphi_n^{i_n}\rangle$, where $\{|\varphi^{i_m}\rangle_m\}$ are the orthonormal basis for part m, the amount of NLS under this product basis is defined as

$$NLS(|\psi\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}, \{|\varphi^{1,\ldots,n}\rangle\}) = 2\left(\sum_{R<R'} P(|\varphi^{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\rangle) P(|\varphi^{i_1',\ldots,i_n'}\rangle)\right)^{1/2},$$

where $R = \sum_k (i_k - 1) * d_{k+1} * \cdots * d_n$ and $P(|\varphi^{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\rangle) = \langle\varphi^{i_1,\ldots,i_n} \mid \psi\rangle_{1,\ldots,n} \langle\psi \mid \varphi^{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\rangle$. The amount of NLS for state $|\psi\rangle_{i_1,\ldots,i_n}$ is

$$NLS(|\psi\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}) = \min NLS(|\psi\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}, \{|\varphi^{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\rangle\}), \qquad (15)$$

where the minimum is taken over all product basis $\{|\varphi^{i_1,\ldots,i_n}\rangle\}$.

Superposition	Basis	$\|GHZ\rangle$	$\|W\rangle$
NLS in A|B|C	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_A \otimes \|\varphi\rangle_B \otimes \|\varphi\rangle_C\}$	1	1.155
NLS in AB|C	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_{AB} \otimes \|\varphi\rangle_C\}$	1	0.943
NLS in AB|C	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_A \otimes \|\varphi\rangle_{BC}\}$	1	0.943
NLS in AC|B	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_{AC} \otimes \|\varphi\rangle_B\}$	1	0.943
LS in A	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_A\}$	1	0.943
LS in B	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_B\}$	1	0.943
LS in C	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_C\}$	1	0.943
LS in AB	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_{AB}\}$	1	0.943
LS in AC	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_{AC}\}$	1	0.943
LS in BC	$\{\|\varphi\rangle_{BC}\}$	1	0.943

TABLE I: Superpositions existing in three partite system. $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B|1\rangle_C$, $|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|1\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle_A|1\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|1\rangle_C$.

For mixed state $\rho_{1,\ldots,n}$, the amount of NLS is

$$NLS(\rho_{1,\ldots,n}) = \min \sum_i p_i NLS(|\psi_i\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}), \qquad (16)$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\left\{p_i,\ |\psi_i\rangle_{1,\ldots,n}\right\}$. Eq. (16) indicates that $NLS(\rho_{1,\ldots,n}) = 0$ iff $\rho_{1,\ldots,n} = \sum_i p_i \rho_1^i \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_n^i$, which is fullly separable. The proof is similar to theorem 5.

LS and NLS can also be defined in partial separable ways. If the Hilbert space is divided as $\{I_1, \ldots, I_k\}$, where I_i is independent subset of $I = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\cup_{l=1}^k I_l = I$, LS and NLS can be defined in the above ways by changing the system to this k partite. $NLS(\rho_{I_1,\ldots,I_k}) = 0$ if and only if the state is k partite separable respect to the above partition.

As defined above in this section, the superpositions existing in multipartite system are plural. It can be in a single part, in some parts, or in all parts of the system. Table 1 shows all the superpositions in a three partite system. In the table, | represents the partition of the system, e.g., AB|C represents taking part A and part B as a whole and dividing the system as part AB and part C. For the examples, $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B|1\rangle_C$, $|W\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|1\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle_A|1\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|1\rangle_C$. These can be easily generalized to $n(n > 3)$ partite system.

Examples: For GHZ-like states $|\psi\rangle = \lambda|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \sqrt{1-\lambda^2}|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B|1\rangle_C$. This state has Schmidt decomposition and is already written in that form. The LS and NLS for this state is shown in Fig. 3 compared with the expression calculated by Schmidt value $2\lambda\sqrt{1-\lambda^2}$.

For W-like states $|\psi\rangle = \lambda/2|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|1\rangle_C + \sqrt{3}\lambda/2|0\rangle_A|1\rangle_B|0\rangle_C + \sqrt{1-\lambda^2}|1\rangle_A|0\rangle_B|0\rangle_C$. Unlike the two partite states and GHZ-like states, there is no Schmidt decomposition of this state. The LS_A, LS_B, LS_C, LS, and NLS is shown in Fig. 4. It can be seen that in three partite case, when there is no Schmidt decomposition, the LS and NLS might be different.



FIG. 3: (color online) GHZ-like states. NLS (asterisk marked), LS (square marked) and $2\lambda\sqrt{1-\lambda^2}$ (blue solid) as the function of parameter λ.



FIG. 4: (color online) W-like states. NLS (blue bold soLS line), LS_A (green dashed line), LS_B (red dash-dotted line), LS_C (dotted black line), and LS (purple thin solid line) as the function of parameter λ.

V. DISCUSSION

The distinctive feature of quantum world different from classical world is state superposition. For composite system, the state superposition can exist between basis of a single part or product basis including two or more

parts. These superpositions are the quantum resources used in quantum information processing. Quantum entanglement and quantum discord have both been considered as quantum resources. As we have showed in this paper, state with local superposition is equivalent to state nonclassical, and state with nonlocal superposition is equivalent to state entangled. From this superposition perspective, the quantum entanglement resource can be considered as the nonlocal superposition in system, while for quantum discord resource, it includes the superposition in single part. However, whether the several kinds of discord introduced before only includes the local superposition is still an open question. From this state superposition aspect, quantum resources are categorized by the superpositions in different parts, and quantum entanglement and quantum discord both capture some kind of specific superposition in the system.

For pure states, we showed that when Schmidt decomposition exists, the amount of LS is the same as NLS. Thus, for these states, the quantification of entanglement can be reduced to the property of the reduced state of a single part, e.g. the entanglement of formation for two partite pure state is defined by the reduced density matrix of either part [17]. However, as we showed, for pure states without Schmidt decomposition, the amount of LS and NLS might be different. For these states, it is inconvenient to study entanglement by the reduced density matrix, and the state superposition view introduced in this paper might be useful.

It should be noted that, in Eq. (7) and Eq. (9), although one kind of measure of superposition is given in the expressions, the specific mathematical formula can be changed. For the mathematical form defined in this paper, we have not yet find the way to calculate the local superposition for mixed two partite states due to the difficulty of taking over all decompositions. Whether there is a way to calculate the local superposition with the mathematical form presented in this paper or there are some other reasonable mathematical definitions that can make all the local superposition and nonlocal superposition easier to calculate is still an open question.

The applications of quantum resources in quantum information processes can also be seen from this state superposition aspect. As state entangled is equivalent to state with nonzero NLS, quantum process, for which quantum entanglement is necessary, such as entanglement swapping [30], can also be considered as having explored the nonlocal superpositions in the system. And the states with zero NLS but nonzero LS can also be useful in some quantum process. For example, the state $\rho = \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle\langle 0|\otimes|-\rangle\langle -|+\frac{1}{2}|+\rangle\langle +|\otimes|1\rangle\langle 1|$, with no nonlocal state superposition but nonzero local state superposition (the proof that this state has nonzero LS is presented in appendix), can be used for remote state preparation, as shown in Ref. [16]. For multipartite case, the superpositions might be very rich, which might exist in any single part, any two partite, or any combination of them. These plural superpositions provide us tremendous ways to explore the quantum feature of quantum systems. Thus, from the perspective of state superposition, our results are useful for the consideration of resource for quantum process.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have studied quantum resources from the perspective of quantum state superposition. We have given clear definition and quantification of local superposition and nonlocal superposition. For states in composite system, the LS is defined as the superposition between basis of a single part and NLS as the superposition between product basis of all parts. From the quantum state superposition perspective, quantum resources are categorized by superpositions existing in different parts. From the aspect of preparation, when nonzero LS presented, quantum operation must be introduced to prepare this state, and when nonzero NLS presented, nonlocal quantum operation must be introduced. We showed that state with zero local superposition is equivalent to state classical and state with zero nonlocal superposition is equivalent to state separable. From this aspect, the quantum entanglement resource can be considered as the nonlocal superposition in system, while for quantum discord resource, we only know that it includes the superposition in single part, and whether it also includes some nonlocal superposition is an open question. From this aspect, the difference between quantum entanglement and quantum discord appears clear.

Besides, LS and NLS are defined in multipartite case. For this case, the kinds of superpositions are plural. We show that for three partite pure state, when there is no Schmidt decomposition, the amount of LS and NLS might be different and this state superposition view might be useful in studying multipartite entanglement. All these results provide us a direction for the consideration of states proper for specific quantum information processes.

This work is supported by the National Science Fund for Distinguished Young Scholars of China (Grant No. 61225003), National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 61101081), and the National Hi-Tech Research and Development (863) Program.

Appendix

1. Detailed proof for the equality $LS_A = 2|\alpha||\beta|$ presented in the proof of theorem 1.

First, write the state as $|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \alpha|0'0'\rangle + \beta|1'1'\rangle$. Since this is a pure state, there is only one kind of decomposition $|\psi\rangle_{AB}\langle\psi|$. Thus, to get the minimum in Eq. (3), we only need to take over all the basis. Consider the

following form of basis:

$$|\varphi\rangle_A = \sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\,|0'\rangle + \cos\tfrac{\theta}{2}e^{i\phi}\,|1'\rangle\,,$$
$$\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A = -\cos\tfrac{\theta}{2}e^{-i\phi}\,|0'\rangle + \sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\,|1'\rangle\,,$$

where $0 \le \theta \le \pi, 0 \le \phi \le 2\pi$. By taking all the values of θ, ϕ, all the basis are taken. According to the definition of $P(|\varphi\rangle_A)$ and $P(\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A)$ in Eq. (2) , we have

$$P(|\varphi\rangle_A) = |\alpha|^2 \sin^2\tfrac{\theta}{2} + |\beta|^2 \cos^2\tfrac{\theta}{2}$$
$$P(\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A) = |\alpha|^2 \cos^2\tfrac{\theta}{2} + |\beta|^2 \sin^2\tfrac{\theta}{2}.$$

By multiplying them,

$$P(|\varphi\rangle_A)P(\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A) = (|\alpha|^4 + |\beta|^4)\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}\cos^2\frac{\theta}{2} + |\alpha|^2|\beta|^2(\sin^4\frac{\theta}{2} + \cos^4\frac{\theta}{2}).$$

Considering that $\cos^2\frac{\theta}{2} = 1 - \sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}$,

$$P(|\varphi\rangle_A)P(\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A) = -(|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2)^2\left[(\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2} - \frac{1}{2})^2 + \frac{1}{4}\right] + |\alpha|^2|\beta|^2.$$

The above formula get the minimum when $\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}$ equals 1 or 0 (with basis $\{|0'\rangle, |1'\rangle\}$), and the minimum is $|\alpha|^2|\beta|^2$. Thus, according to Eq. (3), we have $LS_A = 2|\alpha|\,|\beta|$. Q.E.D.

2. Proof for $0 \le LS_A(\rho_{AB}) \le 1$.

For pure state, we have proved before that $LS_A(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) = 2|\alpha|\,|\beta|$. Since $0 \le 2|\alpha|\,|\beta| \le 1$, thus, for pure state, $0 \le LS_A(|\psi\rangle_{AB}) \le 1$.

For mixed state ρ_{AB}, we first prove that for $|\psi\rangle_{AB}$, the local superposition between any basis is less than or equal 1. For any basis $\{|\varphi\rangle_A, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\}$, we have

$$2\sqrt{P(|\varphi\rangle_A)P(|\varphi^{\perp}\rangle_A)} \le \left(P(|\varphi\rangle_A) + P(\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A)\right) = 1.$$

Thus, $S_A(|\psi\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_A, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\}) \le 1$. For any decomposition $\{p_i,\ |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$,

$$\sum_i p_i S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_A, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\}) \le \sum_i p_i = 1.$$

Thus,

$$\min\sum_i p_i S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, \{|\varphi\rangle_A, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\}) \le 1.$$

Q.E.D.

3. Proof for $LS \ge (LS_A + LS_B)/2$.

According to the definition of local superposition in Eq. (5),

$$LS = \min\frac{1}{2}\sum_i p_i[S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, |\varphi\rangle_A, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A) + S_B(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, |\varphi\rangle_B, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_B)],$$

where the minimum is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i,\ |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$ and all basis $\{|\psi\rangle_A,\ \left|\psi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\}$, $\{|\varphi\rangle_B, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_B\}$. It is straight forward that

$$LS \ge \frac{1}{2}\min\sum_i p_i S_A(|\psi_i\rangle_{AB}, |\varphi\rangle_A, \left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A) + \frac{1}{2}\min\sum_i p_i' S_B(\left|\psi_i'\right\rangle_{AB}, |\varphi\rangle_B, |\varphi^{\perp}\rangle_B),$$

where the minimum in the first term is taken over all decompositions $\{p_i,\ |\psi_i\rangle_{AB}\}$ and all basis $\{|\psi\rangle_A,\ \left|\psi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\}$, and the minimum in the second term is taken over all decompositions $\left\{p_i',\ \left|\psi_i'\right\rangle_{AB}\right\}$ and all basis $\{|\varphi\rangle_B, |\varphi^{\perp}\rangle_B\}$. The last two terms are the definition for LS_A and LS_B. Thus, $LS \ge (LS_A + LS_B)/2$. Q.E.D.

4. Proof for nonzero local superposition in state

$$\rho_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle_A\langle 1| \otimes |+\rangle_B\langle +| + \frac{1}{2}|+\rangle_A\langle +| \otimes |1\rangle_B\langle 1|\,, \quad (17)$$

where $|+\rangle_{A,B} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle_{A,B} + |1\rangle_{A,B}\right)$.

Assume for this state, $LS_A = 0$. According to theorem 2, ρ_{AB} can be written as

$$\rho_{AB} = p_1|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi| \otimes \rho_B^1 + p_2\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\left\langle\varphi^{\perp}\right| \otimes \rho_B^2. \quad (18)$$

By tracing part B, that is $\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_B(\rho_{AB})$, ρ_A reduces to

$$\rho_A = p_1|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi| + p_2\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\left\langle\varphi^{\perp}\right|. \quad (19)$$

The above state is the diagonal form of ρ_A. For the given state ρ_{AB} in Eq. (18), by tracing part B,

$$\rho_A = \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle_A\langle 1| + \frac{1}{2}|+\rangle_A\langle +|.$$

Diagonalizing it and comparing it to Eq. (19), we have

$$p_1 = \tfrac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4},\ p_2 = \tfrac{2-\sqrt{2}}{4}$$
$$|\varphi\rangle_A = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{4+2\sqrt{2}}}\left[|0\rangle_A + (1+\sqrt{2})|1\rangle_A\right]$$
$$\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A = \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{4+2\sqrt{2}}}\left[|0\rangle_A + (1-\sqrt{2})|1\rangle_A\right].$$

Thus, $|1\rangle_A$ and $|+\rangle_A$ can be written as

$$|1\rangle_A = \tfrac{\sqrt{2+\sqrt{2}}}{2}|\varphi\rangle_A - \tfrac{\sqrt{2-\sqrt{2}}}{2}\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A$$
$$|+\rangle_A = \tfrac{\sqrt{2+\sqrt{2}}}{2}|\varphi\rangle_A + \tfrac{\sqrt{2-\sqrt{2}}}{2}\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A.$$

Taking them into Eq. (17),

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{AB} = {} & \tfrac{2+\sqrt{2}}{4}|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi| \otimes \tfrac{1}{2}(|+\rangle_B\langle +| + |1\rangle_B\langle 1|) \\ & + \tfrac{2-\sqrt{2}}{4}\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\left\langle\varphi^{\perp}\right| \otimes \tfrac{1}{2}(|+\rangle_B\langle +| + |1\rangle_B\langle 1|) \\ & + \tfrac{\sqrt{2}}{4}|\varphi\rangle_A\left\langle\varphi^{\perp}\right| \otimes \tfrac{1}{2}(|1\rangle_B\langle 1| - |+\rangle_B\langle +|) \\ & + \tfrac{\sqrt{2}}{4}\left|\varphi^{\perp}\right\rangle_A\langle\varphi| \otimes \tfrac{1}{2}(|1\rangle_B\langle 1| - |+\rangle_B\langle +|).\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above equation to the right side of Eq. (18), and noticing that

$|\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi|, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\langle\varphi^\perp|, |\varphi\rangle_A\langle\varphi^\perp|, |\varphi^\perp\rangle_A\langle\varphi|$ are linearly independent, to make the right side of these two equations equal, the following equality must hold,

$$\frac{1}{2}(|1\rangle_B\langle 1| - |+\rangle_B\langle +|) = 0.$$

However, the above equality obviously does not hold. Thus, the assumption is false. So, $LS_A > 0$. Since $LS \geq (LS_A + LS_B)/2$, thus, $LS > 0$ also holds. Q.E.D.

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
[2] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012).
[3] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
[4] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. Garcia-Patron, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, Rev. Mod. Phys **84**, 621 (2012).
[5] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crépeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. K. Wooters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
[6] D. Bouwmeester, J. W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eibi, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zelinger, Nature (London) **390**, 575 (1997).
[7] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992).
[8] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
[9] C. Weedbrook, A. M. Lance, W. P. Bowen, T. Symul, T. C. Ralph, and P. K. Lam, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 170504 (2004).
[10] S. L. Braunstein, A. Mann, and M. Revzen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3259 (1991).
[11] J. Wenger, M. Hafézi, F. Grosshans, R. Tualle-Brouri, and P. Grangier, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012105 (2003).
[12] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002).
[13] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5672 (1998).
[14] B. P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M. P. Almeida, and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 200501 (2008).
[15] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, B. M. Terhal, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 0777902 (2001).
[16] B. Dakić, Y. O. Lipp, X. Ma, M. Ringbauer, S. Kropatschek, S. Barz, T. Paterek, V. Vedral, A. Zeilinger, Č. Brukner, and P. Walther, Nat. Phys. **8**, 666 (2012).
[17] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
[18] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1997).
[19] V. Vedral and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 1619 (1998).
[20] K. Modi, T. Paterek, V. Vedral, and M. Williamson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 080501 (2010).
[21] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and Č. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010).
[22] B. Bellomo, G. L. Giorgi, F. Galve, R. L. Franco, G. Compagno, and R. Zambrini, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 032104 (2012).
[23] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Science **323**, 5914 (2009).
[24] B. M. Terhal and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 040301 (2000).
[25] S. L. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77** 022301 (2008).
[26] H.M. Wiseman, S.J. Jones and A.C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007).
[27] C. Jarlskog, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 40 (2005).
[28] A. Uhlmann, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **5**, 209 (1998).
[29] G. Gour, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 012318 (2005).
[30] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, M. A. Horne, and A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4287 (1993).